



"Meditate
upon these things;
give thyself
wholly to them;
that thy profiting
may appear unto all"

I Timothy 4:15

Journal of Theology

Church of the Lutheran Confession

VOLUME 25

SEPTEMBER 1985

NUMBER 3

ISSN 0361-1906

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 25

SEPTEMBER 1985

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

- COUNTERACTING THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION WITH THE
TEACHING OF THE IMAGE OF GOD 2
David Lau

- ALLUSIONS TO SCIENCE IN HEBREW CLASS 12
C. Kuehne

BOOK REVIEW AND NOTICE:

- Daniel*, by John C. Jeske 30
Reviewer: Paul F. Nolting

- Family Devotion Hour*, by C. M. Gullerud 40

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Immanuel Lutheran College, 501 Grover Road, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession. Subscriptions: \$5.00 per year, \$9.00 for two years, payable in advance. Issues are dated: March, June, September, and December.

Editor Prof. emer. C. M. Gullerud
218 Grover Road
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Managing Editor Prof. Clifford M. Kuehne

Circulation Manager . . Mr. Benno Sydow
2750 Oxford Street North
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

Staff Contributors . . . D. Lau, J. Lau, P.F. Nolting,
J. Pfeiffer, L.D. Redlin

Correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, etc., should be directed to the circulation manager. Correspondence regarding material published in the JOURNAL should be directed to the editor.

COUNTERACTING THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION WITH THE TEACHING OF THE IMAGE OF GOD

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) said in his essay on atheism: "They that deny a God destroy a man's nobility, for certainly man is of kin to the beasts by his body; and if he be not of kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature."

MAN AND BEAST

Science teaching in the public schools as well as most science textbooks used in Christian schools lay stress on the fact that "man is of kin to the beasts by his body." In other words, man is described as an animal, a mammal, and many points of resemblance are discussed, such as skeleton, heart, digestive organs, brain and nervous system, etc.

There is no point in denying the outward resemblances between man and beast. After all, both man and the beasts of the earth were created by the same Creator on the same day of creation. Therefore, just as we would expect certain similarities in style or workmanship in a chair or table made by the same carpenter, so we can expect God to use some of the same ideas in more than one kind of His creatures.

There are passages in God's Word that point out similarities between the man and the beast. For example, in Genesis 1:29-30, while man was still in Paradise, it is stated that "every herb" shall be man's food as well as the food of the beasts and fowls and creeping things. Since man and beast eat some of the same foods, it is to be expected that the bodily organs in man and beast to assimilate this food will be similar. After the fall into sin, the resemblances between man and beast are so obvious that the Preacher says in Ecclesiastes: "I said to myself concerning the sons of men, 'God has surely tested them in order for them to see that they are but beasts.' For the fate of the sons of men and the fate of beasts is the same. As one dies so

dies the other; indeed, they all have the same breath and there is no advantage for man over beast, for all is vanity. All go to the same place. All came from the dust and all return to the dust" (Eccles. 3:18-20, NASB).

Sometimes it is stated as a difference between man and beast that man has a soul and a beast does not. But here we have to be careful lest in our doctrinal statements we go beyond the express words of Scripture. The King James Version in Genesis 1 and 2 introduces the word "soul" for the first time in Genesis 2:7 in connection with God's creation of man. "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." It would seem then that "soul" here is something that distinguishes man from the other creatures.

However, a careful reader of Genesis 1 and 2 in the original Hebrew language recognizes that the words translated "living soul" are *nephesh chayyah*, and that the identical expression is used of the beasts in Genesis 1:21 and Genesis 1:24. "Let the earth bring forth the living creature (*nephesh chayyah*).\" Likewise "the breath of life" in Genesis 2:7 is an expression that in almost identical terms is used of the animals and man in Genesis 7:22: "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."

On this matter H. C. Leupold says: "Not this breath itself but the manner of its impartation indicates man's dignity. So also the claim that man became 'a living being,' or literally, 'a living soul,' (A. V.) does not point to the distinguishing glory of man. For the same expression is used of other animate beings in 1:24. It must be remembered that the author is at this point chiefly reporting the fact that this lifeless clay became animate by the breath of the Almighty. The fact that man is a superior being is indicated by the manner in which this is done, and this was already amply indicated before by the divine 'image' (1:26)" (*Exposition of Genesis* [Columbus: Wartburg, c1942] 116-117).

So, just as the beasts were lifeless until God animated them or gave them the breath of life so that they became living souls (*nephesh chayyah*) man also was

lifeless until God breathed into him the breath of life and he became a living soul (*nephesh chayyah*). The life of both man and beast can be characterized here as the joining together of body and soul. That is why the death of man and beast can be described in identical terms in Ecclesiastes. So also it is written in Psalm 104:29 concerning all of God's creatures: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath [or spirit], they die, and return to their dust." Confer also Psalm 146:4: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."

In view of this Scriptural way of speaking it seems to me somewhat misleading in this connection to maintain that man has a soul and a beast does not. Of course we remember that it was concerning human beings that Jesus said: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul" (Matt. 10:28), thus teaching the so-called immortality or deathlessness or continued existence of the human soul after the death of the body. The Preacher also makes a distinction between man and beast when he asks: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" (Eccles. 3:21) Likewise the same author says: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (Eccles. 12:7). This establishes firmly enough the difference between the spirit or soul of a beast and the spirit or soul of a man. Also, as indicated above, "the fact that God breathed into man the breath of life indicates that man was given a life principle different from that of the animals" (F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, 4 vols. [St. Louis: Concordia, 1950] 1: 475).

MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

But the characteristic and basic difference between man and beast is recorded in Genesis 1:26-27, where of man alone it is said: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and

female created he them." We interpret Francis Bacon as meaning this when he said that man is of kin to God by his spirit. If then there is no God, or if the so-called deity or deities did not create man different from the beasts as recorded in Genesis 1, then man's nobility is indeed destroyed; man is nothing but an animal, a base and ignoble creature.

What is the kinship between God and man? It is not simply the relationship between Creator and creature, for then all of God's creatures can be said to be made in God's image. The kinship between God and man is not a physical resemblance either, for man, who has body and soul, cannot physically be made like God, who is spirit. Man bears no physical resemblance to God, for God has no physical body. He is spirit, personal but not physical.

We must get our information on the image of God from Scripture. There are two references to the image of God in the writings of Paul. These two are parallel passages, Colossians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24. Both of these letters were written at about the same time, with the same general outline. In Colossians 3:9-10 Paul is speaking of the old man and the new man. He says: "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." The new man in the Christian is continually being renewed in knowledge so as to be like God. The image of God therefore involves a spiritual knowledge, a spiritual kinship that makes it possible for God and man to think the same kind of thoughts and enjoy the most perfect harmony.

The reference in Ephesians 4:24 is similar. The whole sentence (vv. 20-24) goes like this: "But ye have not so learned Christ; If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." The new man, like

Adam and Eve originally, is created in the image of God, or "after God," and this means a spiritual kinship, "righteousness and true holiness."

None of the beasts have this spiritual kinship with God, only man. That is why the distinction between man and the other creatures was made by God in His command after the flood: "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat [food] for you . . . Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man" (Gen. 9:3, 6). We are permitted to kill animals and eat them, but we are not to kill man. For man is "not a base and ignoble creature." Man was created in the image of God, and therefore no matter how depraved sin has made him, he is still not a beast, but a man, to whom a time of grace has been given in the hope that he will repent and come to enjoy what God originally wanted to give him: the tree of life, and perpetual fellowship with God.

Likewise in James 3:9-10 we read: "With the tongue bless we God, even the Father; and with the tongue curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be." Even pronouncing a curse on any man is forbidden because of the unique kinship between God and man. God made man to be like Himself, with holiness and righteousness and spiritual knowledge. How then can we dare to call down God's wrath on any human being whom God wants to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth? For it is to that end that God has made man. (It is granted that we can repeat God's curses on false teachers and unbelievers for a salutary or a saving purpose.)

On the basis of the above passages we confess in the *Brief Statement* of 1932: "We teach that the first man was not brutelike nor merely capable of intellectual development, but that God created man *in His own image*, Gen. 1:26-27; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10, that is, in true knowledge of God and in true righteousness and holiness and endowed with a truly scientific knowledge of nature, Gen. 2:19-23." The last reference is to Adam's amazing ability to name and thus characterize all living creatures, including also his own wife: "This is now bone of

my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."

In wrapping up this discussion of the image of God, we quote from the *Journal of Theology*, July 1971: "When man is in the image of God his mind is in a natural conformity to the mind of God. This, of course, does not mean that man's will and intellect has the power or extent of God's will and intellect, but that the same principles of judgment are held by man as by God. The will of man, then, moves in a parallel way to the will of God, being guided and moved by the will of God" (32).

But even though the image of God was lost by the fall into sin, "men ought not to take each other's lives" "because the Lord has the desire to recreate His image in fallen man" (33). It is God's original desire for man that should guide us in our thinking concerning our fellowman, whether he is believer or unbeliever. We should want him to have what God originally wanted man to have.

EVOLUTION AND THE IMAGE OF GOD

Now this distinct God-created and God-intended spiritual difference between man and beast is what is missing in the world's study of anthropology and the origin of man. Atheistic evolution rules out the existence of a deity altogether, and therefore there is no god for man to be imaged after. Theistic evolution by its very nature must reject the plain, ordinary, literal understanding of Genesis 1 and 2 and thus also God's insistence that He made man as a being different from the beasts by making him in His own image. The results of this loss of God's teaching about the image of God are plain to see in our culture: less respect for human life, as in the increased promotion of abortion and euthanasia; the increase in criminal violence through the neglect of God's Word in Genesis 9:6; and the lowering standards of morality, particularly sexual morality, because of the failure of sociologists to understand the difference in origin between man and beast and the difference between the origin of animal sexual behavior and the origin of human sexual behavior.

Our children are being brought up in a culture that for the most part still accepts evolution as the best possible explanation for the origin of man. No doubt most of us have heard the extreme statements made by so-called Christian evolutionists. For example, a professor in the American Lutheran Church wrote: "To call himself reasonably well educated and informed, a Christian can hardly afford not to believe in evolution. Evolution, including human evolution, is no longer in contention. . . . And to announce that you do not believe in evolution is as irrational as to announce that you do not believe in electricity" (*Dialog*, Autumn 1963). A more recent article in the *U. S. News & World Report* (9 June 1980) maintains the same position: "Virtually all scientists agree that evolution is a fact beyond dispute."

There has been an upsurge in the activity of creationist scientists in the last few years. Opponents of evolution have dared to become more vocal. Even President Ronald Reagan stated publicly: "[Evolution] is a scientific theory only, and in recent years has been challenged in the world of science" (Religious News Service, 25 August 1980).

As creationists become more vocal, evolutionists are bound to become more vocal also. They are being seriously attacked for the first time in many years, and they are probably going to become more aggressive in fighting for their beliefs. The children in our public schools, and those children in Christian schools using standard science textbooks, and the general public listening to television programs, viewing state and national park displays, and keeping their ears open, are going to be affected and possibly influenced.

As pastors and teachers of the people of God, we have to take the lead in counteracting the teaching of evolution with the teaching of the image of God. The battle lines are clearly drawn. "The Bible tells us that God created man in His own image, but the evolutionist would have us believe that man is an animal which evolved from lower animal forms" (*Is Evolutionism the Answer?* [Milwaukee: Northwestern, c1967] 63).

SOME PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

We know then what we should do and how important it is that we do it. But perhaps some practical suggestions as to how this can be done will be welcomed. We are thinking particularly of the Sunday School situation.

The creation account (Genesis 1), of course, gives us our first opportunity to impress on our students the importance of the image of God. The beasts of the earth, although created also on the sixth day, were not made in God's image. But human beings, both the man and the woman, were made in God's image. The *Advanced Bible History* explains: "Different from other visible creatures; resembling God: rational, knowing God, righteous, holy." We have not used the word "rational" in defining God's image because the Bible does not so define it. Nevertheless, the scientific study of nature as carried out by Adam surely indicated to him as to us a difference in mental capacity and reasoning power between Adam and the other creatures. Compare animals and man with regard to such matters as speech and prayer and planning for the future and remembering the past. Hurlbut's *Story of the Bible* introduces man's standing up on two legs as a characteristic that makes him different from the animals. Surely it is better to stick with God's explanation of the image of God.

The account of man and Paradise (Genesis 2) also gives us an opportunity to speak of the image of God. There was no companion for Adam among the animals. But Eve, made in God's image from Adam, was a fitting companion.

Of course we teach these Genesis accounts as true history, not as legends or myths or as truth-teaching fables. By listing Adam in Luke 3 as an ancestor of our Lord Jesus, the Holy Spirit has certainly made it clear that Adam and Eve truly were actual persons living on this earth at a definite time and in a definite place. There can be absolutely no compromise between the Bible

account and any theory of evolution that includes the evolution of man from animal creatures.

The account of Cain's murder of his brother Abel (Gen. 4) gives us another opportunity to impart God's teaching concerning the image of God. Since God made coats of skins for Adam and Eve, He must have either killed some animals Himself or used the skins of animals that died after the introduction of sin. It is not a sin in itself to kill an animal. But Cain killed a human being, and human beings were made in the image of God. It is true that the image of God was lost through the fall into sin. Genesis 5:3 says that Adam "begat a son in his own likeness, after his image," in contrast to God's creating him "in the likeness of God" (Gen. 5:1). But still the fact that God had once made man in His image means that God intended man to enjoy eternal life, and He does not want any opportunity to enjoy that life to be taken from man. Killing a man is the sin that it is because, as the 1984 WELS revision of the Gausewitz catechism says (p. 65), "God created man in His own image; and gives us this life as a time for the renewal of that image." The image of God is renewed through God's working, by means of the promise of a Savior, faith in that promise. The difference between killing an animal and killing a man made in God's image ought to be emphasized in our teaching of the Cain and Abel account, as well as of any other murder in Scripture, and in our teaching of the Fifth Commandment.

As we continue in Genesis, we come to the flood and God's covenant with man after the flood as revealed in the rainbow. When we teach this account, we again have the opportunity to impress on our students the concept of the image of God. For it was at this time that God gave Noah permission to kill all the animals for food, but he was not to nourish himself through cannibalism. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man" (Gen. 9:6). At this point also it can be pointed out to our students that capital punishment is not contrary to the will of God, but the very punishment required to impress on

everyone the special nature of human life. Before the flood capital punishment was not ordered by God, with the result that a hardened sinner like Lamech bragged to his two wives about the murder he had committed and challenged anyone to punish him. "If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold" (Gen. 4:24). In such a wicked world as this, capital punishment is a blessing of God to protect human life.

In discussing the sin of cursing under the Second Commandment or in connection with Goliath's cursing of David or Shimei's cursing of David it can be pointed out that cursing is sinful for the same reason that killing is sinful. It is calling for evil to come down on someone whom God wants to save, someone in fact for whom Jesus died. "With the tongue bless we God, even the Father; and with the tongue curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be" (Jas. 3:9-10).

We shall not take the time to look for further examples of opportunities to impress on our students the concept of the image of God. If we as teachers are aware of the importance of this doctrine, and if we realize that this teaching is something our children are not receiving in the public schools or in science textbooks, we shall look for opportunities to present this teaching in a conscious effort to oppose the devilish notion of evolution, which erases the basic difference between man and beast and contributes to man's understanding of himself as a well-developed animal rather than as a special creature of God made in His own image.

May God give us strength and wisdom for this struggle, for the eternal welfare of our children hangs in the balance. There is only a short step from the denial of the first Adam to the denial of the second Adam, our Lord Jesus, who recovered for the sinful world what the first Adam lost. Without Him we have lost everything.

D. Lau

ALLUSIONS TO SCIENCE IN HEBREW CLASS

INTRODUCTION

Allusions to science in Hebrew class? Ought an instructor in Biblical Hebrew permit such departures from the teaching of the vocabulary and grammar of the language? Surely none of us will deny that there are allusions to science in those creation and flood accounts of Genesis which form a part of the reading assignments in Hebrew 102 at Immanuel Lutheran College. Moreover, while the Bible is not primarily a textbook on science, yet whenever it speaks on scientific topics it presents to us facts that are scientifically correct and historically accurate. This will be evident to anyone who has come to accept the claims of Holy Scripture to be the verbally inspired, inerrant Word of God. As we confess in the *Brief Statement*: "Since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, it goes without saying that they contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters, John 10:35" (par. 1).

But why spend valuable class time in discussing matters which seem rather remote from the learning of the Hebrew language? Simply because we are serving our young people well if we as pastors and teachers at times discuss the issue of creation vs. evolution on the basis of those texts or topics which are properly part of our class endeavor. For we know well how frequently these students are confronted in life with the proud pretensions of the evolutionary theory.

It is true, of course, that a believing acceptance of the creation account in Genesis can come about only through the work of the Holy Spirit through the Gospel. For the Bible says: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God" (Heb. 11:3). Yet it is surely not wrong to make use of the scientific allusions in Scripture and also the data of science to show the unscriptural and unscientific nature of the evolutionary theory.

Compare, for example, these words from Franz Pieper concerning such Christian apologetics: "The arguments which call forth only a human faith (*fidem humanam*) would be underestimated if we declared them to be utterly worthless. Also Christ and His Apostles used them on occasion. Such rational arguments serve to show how frivolous are the judgments of unbelief against the divinity of Scripture. These arguments may be used to good advantage also in the case of Christians who are afflicted with doubts as to the divine character of Scripture. These doubts arise from the unbelieving flesh of the Christians, and through these rational arguments the flesh of the Christians is outwardly checked and subdued. Arguments of reason, historical arguments, etc., can also be of service in the conversion of a person by inducing those outside the Church to read or hear the Word of God itself and so come to faith in the Word by the operation of the Holy Ghost through the Word" (*Christian Dogmatics*, 4 vols. [St. Louis: Concordia, 1950] 1: 311).

In the paragraphs which follow, I shall discuss some of the allusions to science which are contained in the Hebrew texts of the creation and flood accounts. In a typical school year I would not bring up all of these topics in the Hebrew class, nor would I attempt to cover them in the kind of detail indicated below. For the purpose of the class must, of course, remain the learning of the language itself.

GENESIS 1:1

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." We recognize in these words a creation both of time and of the material universe. There are many who regard matter and energy as eternally existent, but we reject such a notion as being contrary to a proper interpretation of this passage. It is true that the verb "create" (*bārā'*) means merely to make something new that did not exist before, with no reference to the materials which may or may not have been used. Yet we must reject any suggestion that God's activities on this first day involved only the reworking of previously

existent materials, for the Holy Spirit states in Hebrews 11:3 that "the worlds [$\alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$, the time-space universe] were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." (Cf. also Ps. 33:6,9; 90:2; Rom. 4:17.) It is true, of course, that on *subsequent* days of creation week God's creative activity did at times involve the use of previously existing materials which He had called into existence on the first day, such as when He "created" man by forming him from the dust of the ground (Gen. 1:27, 2:7).

[By "the heavens and the earth" (*hashshāmayim w^ehā'ārets*) we understand the entire universe, including the angelic creatures and their abode. We should recognize that the term "heaven" or "heavens" is used in Scripture in a three-fold sense. At times it refers to the atmosphere where the birds fly and from which the rain falls (cf. Gen. 1:20; Deut. 11:11; Jer. 4:25). Again it is used of what we call outer space, in which the sun, moon, and stars are found (cf. Deut. 4:19). And finally it is used of the blessed abode of God and the holy angels--the "third heaven" of which the Apostle Paul speaks (2 Cor. 12:2).] That the angels were created during the six days of creation week is evident from such passages as Exodus 20:11: "For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." The supposition that the angels were created on the first day seems best, since they were present to sing the praises of God when He laid the foundations of the earth (Job 38:6f.).

GENESIS 1:2

"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." We are here immediately involved in a discussion of that theory, widely publicized by the *Scofield Reference Bible* and accepted by a large number of Christian sects, which is known variously as the gap theory, the ruin-reconstruction theory, the restoration theory, and the restitution

theory. According to this theory, the physical earth and the fossils contained therein are really as old as the evolutionists claim. For between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 there is a time gap of millions or billions of years! The adherents of this theory state that the earth spoken of in verse 1 was filled with plants and animals, and possibly even populated by pre-Adamic human beings. This original earth was destroyed by God at the time of the fall of Satan, and thereby became "without form and void" (*tōhû wābhōhû*). In this violent overthrow, involving also a pre-Noachic flood, vast numbers of plants and animals were buried and fossilized. Subsequently, during the six days of creation week, this ruined earth was reconstructed, and the plant, animal, and human life was restored.

According to those who accept this gap theory, Genesis 1:2 must be translated: ". . . and then the earth *became* without form and void." They affirm that the *waw* indicates historical sequence and that the verb "was" (*hāyāh*) must be taken in its "normal" sense of "became." Some also point to the KJV translation of Genesis 1:28: "replenish [refill] the earth." What can we say in response? Note the syntax of verse 2: *waw* + subject + perfect tense. If instead of this the Hebrew had a *waw*-consecutive imperfect, and if the preposition "to" (*l*^e) preceded "without form and void," then their arguments would bear some weight. For the *waw*-consecutive imperfect often does indicate temporal sequence, and *hāyāh* followed by *l*^e is used in the Old Testament in the sense of "became" (cf. Gen. 2:7). As the verse stands, however, we must take it in this sense: "Now [transitional *waw*] as far as the earth is concerned, it was without form and void." Following the statement regarding the creation of the heavens and the earth in verse 1, the holy writer now focuses the attention of the reader specifically upon the earth, which is the location of God's activities through the remainder of the chapter. The verb "was," which could have been omitted as a simple copula, is used so that the noun "earth" can be placed into an emphatic position before the verb. (You will recall that the normal word order in Hebrew places a finite verb *before* its subject.)

Over against the ruin-reconstructionists it must, moreover, be pointed out that this latter interpretation is supported also by parallel constructions elsewhere in the Old Testament. Compare Jonah 3:3: "So Jonah arose, and went unto Nineveh, according to the word of the LORD. *Now Nineveh was [w^enîn^ewēh hāy^ethā]* an exceeding great city of three days' journey." The words indicated by italics could hardly be rendered: " . . . *and then Nineveh became* an exceeding great city!"

The adherents of the gap theory try to bolster their argument by suggesting that the terms "without form and void" indicate judgment and devastation in their Old Testament usage. It must be recognized that these terms do occur in Isaiah 34:11 and Jeremiah 4:23 in contexts of divine retribution. Other passages, however, can be found in which the first of the terms (the second occurs only in Gen. 1:2 and the aforementioned passages) is used in a context where judgment is not evident. Compare Job 26:7: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place [*tōhû*], and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Here the word denotes merely emptiness. Surely we are not going contrary to Biblical usage, therefore, when we affirm that "without form and void" in Genesis 1:2 can mean simply that the earth, as it stood following the initial creative act, was in an unordered state and lacking those various forms which were called into being on the subsequent days. (We probably do well not to use such a word as "chaotic," which has a negative connotation, lest we lend support to the ideas of the ruin-reconstructionists.)

Perhaps the most effective way to refute the gap theory is to cite Exodus 20:11: "In six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." The context of this passage clearly places the creation of the entire universe within the scope of six, literal, 24-hour days. How do the ruin-reconstructionists respond? They affirm that "made" (*‘āśāh*) here does not mean create out of nothing, but refers only to a reconstructive activity. But a fair reading of the creation account in Genesis must convince one that the holy writer, Moses, is using the terms "created" and "made" synonymously. Compare Gene-

sis 1:26 and 27: "And God said, Let us make man in our image . . . So God created man in his own image . . ."; Genesis 2:3: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made [literally, created by making]"; etc.

A brief comment needs to be made also with regard to the KJV translation of Genesis 1:28: "replenish the earth." The verb occurring here [*mālē*'] means simply "fill," not "refill"!

The gap theory is in some respects an appealing one, because it seems to enable a Christian to retain the Biblical account and yet accept the claim of geologists that the earth is billions of years old. Since it is held by so many sectarians, it is probable that pastors will at times run into it in their ministries. A very complete refutation of this false position is found in chapter 5 of John C. Whitcomb's *The Early Earth* (Winona Lake: BMH, c1972). This volume is a fine defense of Biblical creationism by a recognized theologian and scientist. The only doctrinally questionable statements which this essayist has found in it were two seeming references to a future millennial kingdom here on earth (58, 127).

THE WORD "DAY"

The word "day" [*yôm*] is used repeatedly in the creation account. Some who regard themselves as Christians would like to expand the six days of Genesis 1 into periods of thousands or even millions of years--the so-called day-age theory. They point out that the word "day" is used in a variety of senses in the Bible, and that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Pet. 3:8).

The use of the above-cited passage in support of the day-age theory surely involves a deplorable wresting of Scripture, against which Peter himself warns (2 Pet. 3:16). For one thing, the verse says, not "is a thousand years," but "is as a thousand years." But more than that, the six thousand years which they would

thereby inject into creation week is far too short a time for an alleged evolution to take place.

But what about the Old Testament usage of "day"? It does indeed have a variety of meanings, even in the creation account itself. For example, in Genesis 1:5 the term is used of the daylight portion of a twenty-four hour period, and in Genesis 2:4 it seems to refer to the entire six-day creative period: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens." Yet a fair reading of Genesis 1 must convince one that the six creation days were normal days of twenty-four hours each. Note, for example, how each of them is defined as consisting of an evening and a morning. Furthermore, according to Hebrew scholars, whenever in the Old Testament the word "day" is connected with a definite numeral, as repeatedly in Genesis 1, it is used of a normal solar day.

Surely Exodus 20:9-11 should settle the argument. For the creation days are there associated with the 24-hour days with which the Israelites in the desert were familiar: "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it."

The day-age theory has gained adherents because it seems to offer a synthesis between the creation account of Genesis and the claims of evolution. The followers of this theory assign to God the role of creating the original matter and energy and of directing in some fashion the subsequent slow evolutionary process. Such theistic evolution represents an untenable compromise. It must be rejected by any Christian who holds to a proper grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture; and it will be rejected also by any consistent evolutionist, who according to his theory really has no need at all for divine intervention. A believer whose

heart has been touched by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, even though he may not be conversant with the original languages of Scripture, will recognize quickly that the God presented by theistic evolution is hardly the personal, almighty, provident, and loving God of the Bible.

GENESIS 1:7

Martin Luther frankly confessed that he could not fully understand the words of the Holy Spirit in Genesis 1:7: "And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so" (*Luther's Works*, American ed. 1: 30). And we, who were not present during creation week nor during the year-long Noachic flood, cannot affirm with dogmatic certainty just what kind of physical situation existed between this second day of creation week and the great deluge. Yet there are hints within the Biblical record that enable one to suggest something like the following: During creation week God placed high within the atmosphere large quantities of water, possibly in the form of dense water vapor. The weather and climate existing between creation and the flood may have been very different from that which we now know. The earth was apparently watered, not by rain (cf. Gen. 2:5), but by a mist which would go up (frequentative imperfect in the Hebrew) from the earth and water the whole face of the ground (Gen. 2:6). If there were such a vapor canopy, there would moreover have been a rather uniform, temperate climate prior to the flood (the so-called greenhouse effect), making possible luxuriant vegetation over most of the land areas, even into the high latitudes. At the time of the flood the vast reserves of water high in the atmosphere were released in the form of torrential rainfall for a period of forty days. The terminology of Scripture is especially vivid: ". . . the windows [² *arubbōth*: literally lattices or openings; hence windows, sluices, floodgates] of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (Gen. 7:11f.). Following the flood we find the first reference to a rainbow, which perhaps was

not visible prior to the flood, and to the distinct seasons of summer and winter involving heat and cold (Gen. 9:13; 8:22).

If the above description, drawn from the book of Genesis, is substantially correct, it would explain many of the facts alluded to in Scripture and observed by science. There is widespread evidence in the fossil record that the earth once supported a much more luxuriant vegetation over a much wider land area. This vegetation would in turn have provided sufficient food to support the vast quantities of animal life that are similarly indicated in the fossil record, including such giant forms as the dinosaurs. After the flood the climate was apparently more hostile. This could have reduced the food supply to the point where the dinosaurs could no longer maintain themselves and consequently became extinct.

If there were a vapor canopy prior to the flood, it would moreover have effectively shielded the earth from certain destructive rays from the sun, which could in turn have slowed the degenerative effects of aging in man. We notice in the Genesis record that the normal span of life prior to the flood was close to 1000 years, while after the flood there is a steady decrease until we reach the "threescore years and ten" spoken of by Moses in Psalm 90.

GENESIS 1:9

On the third day of creation week God said: "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear." During this separation process the normal effects of flowing water could well have resulted in the formation of the deeper sedimentary rock layers of the earth, which layers do not contain any fossils and which therefore probably originated prior to the flood.

THE "KINDS" OF GENESIS 1

One of the most significant terms in the creation account is the word "kind" (*mîn*). It occurs no less

than ten times in the first chapter of Genesis. We are told that God created plants and animals according to distinct groupings called "kinds," and that all subsequent reproduction would take place according to these created groupings.

Unfortunately, some scientists many years ago identified the Genesis kind with the taxonomic category of species (this identification is still found in some Hebrew lexicons), and thereby imposed upon creationism the false concept of fixity of species. For many years creationists denied that any variation could take place in any of the created kinds, and this unnecessary assertion brought upon them much ridicule from the evolutionists. Surely we cannot deny that variation is a real thing in the plant and animal life of this world. Compare how selective breeding has developed a wide variety of roses and has produced a variety of dogs that ranges from the tiny Chihuahua to the giant Saint Bernard. And yet the uniform evidence of Scripture and of science indicates that when God created plants and animals according to certain "kinds," He imposed upon these distinct kinds definite limits beyond which the variation has not gone and cannot go. Darwin observed a lot of varieties of finches on the Galapagos Islands, but these varieties were all clearly identifiable as finches. We think moreover of how scientists have done everything that they can think of to bring about genetic mutations in the lowly fruit fly, but they have never come up with anything other than a fruit fly. And we notice how our little children can observe the amazing variety of animal life, and yet have no trouble at all in identifying correctly the "dogness," "catness," "horseness," etc. that mark the distinctive kinds of animals which God created.

If the question is raised as to which taxonomic category of the biologist (kingdom, phylum, class, order, family, genus, or species, and all of the super- and sub- categories thereof) corresponds to the Genesis kind, no clear answer has yet been given. The word "kind" is used of a number of distinct groupings of animals in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14, some of which groupings may correspond to the narrower cate-

gories of species or genus, and others of which may correspond to the broader categories of family or order. The biologists have unfortunately developed their classification scheme according to the presuppositions of the evolutionary theory, so one should not expect a correlation with the Genesis kinds. Taxonomy would be farther ahead if biologists had only accepted the Genesis account and sought to identify the created kinds of plant and animal life on the basis of the criteria found within Scripture, such as true fertilization in reproduction. Because of the aforementioned lack of correlation, creationist scientists have adopted a new technical term for the "kind" of Genesis 1, the *baramin*, which word is a transliteration of the Hebrew for "created kind."

Darwin recognized in his day that the fossil record did not support his theory concerning gradual change from one type of organism to another. But he was optimistic that subsequent finds would support his ideas. In the century since Darwin hundreds of thousands of additional fossils have been found and analyzed. But the "missing links" remain missing. In fact, there is such a profound absence of genuine missing links that any unbiased person must admit that there simply is no such thing as a chain of gradual evolutionary development "from amoeba to man."

This situation has been recognized by a growing number of evolutionists, and some of them have rejected all forms of Darwinian gradualism and are now strongly promoting so-called punctuated equilibrium as the mechanism by which evolution has taken place. According to this latter notion, genetic stability (equilibrium) has been the normal thing among living organisms--precisely what the fossil record indicates--but this stability has on occasion been broken (punctuated) by sudden large-scale changes from one type of organism to another. Because these alleged changes took place in quantum leaps, there would as a result be little or no evidence in the fossil record of intermediate forms.

One can illustrate punctuated equilibrium by this example: One day a reptile laid an egg, the sun hatched it out, and away flew a bird! One wonders how serious

scientists could promote such a theory with a straight face, since it involves manifest difficulties. It is, for example, straining the imagination beyond belief to suppose that two such happy accidents (called "hopeful monsters") would occur at roughly the same time and in the same general locality, so as to produce a male and female of the same species which would be physically and genetically capable of producing offspring. Yet these scientists are willing to believe such absurdities, for the alternative would be to give up the theory of evolution itself and accept creation--and this they are unwilling to do! We think of the words of the Apostles Paul and Peter, who speak of men who willfully reject the clear evidence of the eternal power and divine attributes of God in the things which He has created and foolishly believe the lies which they have fabricated in their unbelieving hearts (Rom. 1; 2 Pet. 3).

GENESIS 1:31

At the close of the creation account in Genesis 1, we read: "And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." We should note well the words "very good," especially in view of the "behold" which precedes them. The completed creation was supremely excellent in the sight of the almighty and all-wise Creator Himself. Surely this involves an absence of sin and death. But we should not restrict the phrase to this, inasmuch as the preceding verses deal extensively with the physical aspects of the world and universe. The cosmos stood at the end of the sixth day as a fully developed, fully functioning creation. Adam and Eve, for example, appeared as mature adults. The earth possessed a layer of fertile soil which under present circumstances would take hundreds of years to develop. The radioactive decay cycle within rocks was very possibly represented in all its phases, including both intermediate and final decay products. And if the stars are really as far from the earth as most astronomers claim--and some scientists are now questioning this--the light between them and the earth had also been

created by God, so that Adam and Eve could begin enjoying the night sky immediately.

On the basis of the words "very good," we can surely affirm that all of the objects of God's creation were already at the end of creation week present in their fully functioning completeness. The creation therefore began with an appearance of age. If modern-day evolutionists could be transported back to the sixth day, they would probably come up with the same inflated ages that they now claim for the earth and universe. Some have said that a creation with such apparent age would involve deception on the part of God, since He would thereby have made it impossible for man to arrive at a proper estimate of the age of the cosmos through an examination of natural phenomena. We respond that God has deceived no one, for in His Word He has revealed in sufficient detail the methods and the time-frame which He employed in His act of creation.

But the words "very good" should have an effect also on our lives as Bible-believing Christians. We should open our eyes to the marvelous design evident in the things which God has made, and then testify to our families, our classes, our congregations, and others of His wisdom and power. Notice how the Psalmist looked at his body and marvelled; he gazed up into the night sky and discerned the glory and handiwork of God (Ps. 139:14; 19:1). Notice how Solomon took the time to observe such things as the flight of an eagle through the air and the movement of a snake upon a rock, and concluded that such things were too remarkable for him to understand (Prov. 30:18f.). There is so much that we can see with our own eyes, and when the objects involved are either too small or too remote for us to observe, there are numerous books which can help us contemplate even more fully the divine attributes of God as evidenced in His creation.

GENESIS 2:1-2

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh

day from all his work which he had made." The creative activity of God came to an end at the close of the sixth day. His role thereafter became that of Preserver, even as the holy writers of the New Testament testify concerning the Son: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible . . . And he is before all things, and by him all things consist [hold together or continue to exist]" (Col. 1:16f.); and again: " . . . upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3).

Many years ago scientists recognized the fact that matter and energy are neither being created nor destroyed--evidence of God's continuing preservation of what He has made. They called this principle of conservation the first law of thermodynamics, and it's one of the most firmly established laws in all of science!

GENESIS 3

That the fall into sin has had a harmful effect, not only on man, but also on the rest of creation, is evident from a number of passages in Holy Scripture. The Psalmist speaks of the earth and heavens as growing old like a garment (102:26), and the Apostle Paul states that the entire creation is groaning and travailing in pain because of mankind's sin (Rom. 8:22).

Here too scientists have recognized the obvious fact that the cosmos is deteriorating before our very eyes. Disintegration and corruption are seen everywhere. The vigor of youth becomes the feebleness of old age; the shiny new car ends up a rusting hulk in the junkyard; the amount of energy available for accomplishing useful work is steadily decreasing. These manifestations of growing decay and disorder lie behind the so-called second law of thermodynamics--again a universally recognized law of science.

It is a remarkable fact that most evolutionists have had trouble in seeing the obvious contradiction between the second law, which predicts that everything must go downhill with respect to order and complexity, and the theory of evolution, which affirms that some things are moving uphill. Numerous evolutionists have

tried to explain away the relevance of the second law to arguments opposing their theory, but creationist scientists have succeeded in affirming the validity of the testimony of this law in such arguments.

GENESIS 6 - 9

There are obviously many passages in the flood account which have a bearing on science. It is self-evident that a hydrologic catastrophe of that magnitude would have a profound effect upon the earth. Several books have been written by creationist scientists to demonstrate how the flood can account for such things as the deep layers of fossil-bearing sedimentary rock, the massive erosion seen in a place like the Grand Canyon, the existence of vast fossil graveyards scattered around the world, and the presence of coal and petroleum deposits.

As we read through portions of the account in Hebrew class, there are a number of places where scientific comment is difficult to repress. Mention has already been made of the windows of the heavens being opened, with the release of vast quantities of water upon the earth. In the same verse (Gen. 7:11) we find the words: "all the fountains of the great deep were broken up [*nibhq^eû kol-ma^cy^enôth t^ehôm rabbâ*]." This statement indicates something much more violent than a quiet flowing of water from springs in the surface of the earth. Who knows what tremendous geologic activity may have accompanied this vast releasing of subterranean water--earthquakes, eruptions, etc. In one of the Psalms we are given clear evidence of the magnitude of the physical forces that were at work during the months that the flood prevailed upon the earth:

He established the earth upon its foundations,
 So that it will not totter forever and ever.
 Thou didst cover it with the deep as with a garment;
 The waters were standing above the mountains.
 At Thy rebuke they fled;
 At the sound of Thy thunder they hurried away.
 The mountains rose; the valleys sank down

To the place which Thou didst establish for them
 Thou didst set a boundary that they may not pass over;
 That they may not return to cover the earth.

(Ps. 104:5-9, NASB)

In Genesis 8 we learn that as the waters of the flood receded these waters were continually in motion, which fact readily accounts for the varying strata that can be seen in the sedimentary rocks and for the kind of fossil deposition which scientists have discovered. Compare verses 3 and 5, which in literal translation read: "And the waters returned from off the earth, going and returning. . . . And the waters remained [*hāyû*], going and receding, until the tenth month." (The essayist recognizes that verse 3 may mean simply that the waters continued to return from off the earth [cf. a similar construction in Gen. 12:9], but even this would have involved large-scale hydrologic activity.) The picture which we are given in this chapter is anything but a quiet, tranquil lowering of the water level!

CONCLUSIONS

When we consider even a few of the scientific implications of the creation and flood accounts in Genesis, we can understand the repeated affirmation of creationist scientists that the data of science can be fit far more easily into a creation-flood framework than into an evolutionistic framework, and that in a sense it's easier to believe the creation account of Scripture than to believe in some kind of evolutionary process. Yet the large majority of scientists remain evolutionists. Why? Because of the hidden bias that lurks within the flesh of every human being. That we are not among those latter-day scoffers (2 Pet. 3:3-7) who deny creation, the flood, and that third major catastrophic intervention of God in the physical history of this world, judgment day, is due alone to the faith-creating power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ!

It has perhaps become apparent that this essayist has a special interest in the allusions to science within the accounts of creation and the flood. Let me anticipate some legitimate reactions to this paper by admitting now that there are several dangers which lie in such an interest. One can be so taken up with the scientific aspects of these accounts, that he loses sight of the vastly more important spiritual aspects; one can become so involved in testifying to creation and preservation, that he neglects the proclamation of redemption and sanctification.

But I am convinced from personal experience that there is another danger, that of failing to assist as well as we might those fellow Christians in our spiritual care whose faith is assailed by doubt because of the loud and haughty assertions of modern-day evolutionists. Satan has a real thing going with such denials of creation, for he knows well that when Genesis 1 falls, everything else in the Bible must also subsequently fall. May the lamentable spiritual drop-out problem among our post-confirmation young people be due at least in part to their inability to cope with the pervasive evolutionistic thrust of the instruction which they receive in public high schools and colleges? Do we not have an obligation as pastors and teachers also to "convince the gainsayers" (Tit. 1:9), that is, to refute those who contradict the testimony of the divine Word?

We are fortunate in that we do not have to become scientists ourselves in order to do this. Various publishing houses have been producing a wealth of material for every grade level on the subject of creation vs. evolution, items which we can read and then place into the hands of young people in public schools or of others who have become disturbed by the pseudo-scientific nonsense which they have heard from the lips of a Carl Sagan on TV or read on the pages of magazines and newspapers. In my opinion it would be good also if we individually attempted to keep up to date on the subject of creation vs. evolution through the reading of a periodical such as the *Bible-Science Newsletter*.

It is moreover probable that, as the citizens of our country move farther into the post-Christian culture of the Western world, our missionary endeavor will have to involve a clear proclamation of the truths of creation and preservation. We observe that when the apostles addressed themselves to those who knew and accepted the testimony of Scripture, they would generally begin with a preaching of sin and grace (cf. Acts 13:16ff.). But when they approached the heathen Gentiles, such as the citizens of Lystra and Athens, they would begin with an affirmation of God's creation and preservation of the world and universe (cf. Acts 14:14ff.; 17:22ff.). Such testimony can still touch the conscience of man, for deep down inside even the professed athiest knows that there is a God who has made him, a God to whom he will someday have to give account. The Apostle Paul says of such unbelievers: "They know the judgment of God" (Rom. 1:32).

When the Jews protested the praises of Jesus' disciples on Palm Sunday, He responded: "I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out" (Luke 19:40). There are surely many in our day who would deny to the Lord the praises which belong to Him as the almighty Creator and Preserver. But nature itself cries out in a voice both loud and clear that there is a God in heaven, a God who has made and continues to preserve all things, a God who is marvelously good to all of His creatures both great and small!

C. Kuehne

BOOK REVIEW AND NOTICE

Daniel, by John C. Jeske. Milwaukee: Northwest-ern, 1985. 229 pages, paperback, \$6.50.

This is the third volume in *The People's Bible* series, the previous two being *Exodus* by Ernest H. Wendland and *Thessalonians* by David P. Kuske. (The latter was reviewed in the December 1984 issue of the *Journal of Theology* by D. Lau.)

This reviewer found *Daniel* extremely readable. Sufficient historical data is included to establish a historical frame of reference for the reader and to give the visions historical life. Quotations from other prophets and other parts of Scripture in connection with applications to life give the volume a distinctly devotional flavor. For those who prepare copy for printing and do the proofreading page 203 will be a comfort, for a paragraph from Josephus is neatly printed twice. So much for modern technology and man's oversight!

The book is outlined simply as follows: chapters 1-6: historical section; chapters 7-12: prophetic section. Another division, characteristic of this book only, is made: chapters 1, 8-12: written in Hebrew; chapters 2-7: written in Aramaic.

This commentary was written primarily for lay persons, so one would not expect to find extensive apologetics or polemics. Yet the readers of this commentary may well be exposed to the *Scofield Bible* and can hardly escape the invasion of their privacy by electronic preachers through television, most of whom espouse the dispensational or premillennial interpretation of prophecy with its "end-time" scheme of events. This reviewer feels that it is high time and possibly past time for Lutheran theologians to begin equipping the saints with defenses against this "evangelical heresy."

In general this reviewer feels that the writer did not sufficiently and precisely emphasize the purpose and effect of the prophecies on Daniel and his contemporary believers. We dare never forget the historical situation in which prophecy was given. Prophecy was never

given in an historical vacuum; it was always extremely practical. What was revealed to the prophets was revealed for their personal edification and for the rebuke, the instruction, and the comfort of their contemporaries. To lose sight of this truth is to fall into the error of the futurists who, in the name of literalism, lift much of prophecy from its historical setting and transpose it to their own fictional "end-time" eschatology.

This reviewer would like to comment only on the prophecies, taking issue especially with the *terminus ad quem* of the visions in chapter 8 and 10-12.

Chapter 2: The Great Colossus. In the form of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which Daniel reproduced and interpreted for him, the "God in heaven . . . has shown King Nebuchadnezzar what will happen in days to come" (v. 28). "In days to come" is the Hebrew **בְּיָמֵי הָעָתִיד** which occurs fourteen times in the Old Testament, only here in the Aramaic. The writer defines the terms as follows: "The expression refers to the future in general and, in particular, to the days of the Messiah in the final period of human history. Actually, the period of history covered by Nebuchadnezzar's dream is vast, reaching from Nebuchadnezzar's own day down to the end of time" (39). The words "the future in general" could well have been omitted, for the time term also has covenantal or Kingdom connotations. It is never secular, marking the mere flow of time. Here the *terminus a quo* is the heyday of the Babylonian Empire with the *terminus ad quem* reaching from the initiation to the consummation of the Messianic or New Testament era.

The prophetic interpretation of the dream was a preachment of both Law and Gospel. For King Nebuchadnezzar and mighty Babylon, who would shortly conquer and seemingly destroy the Kingdom of God in its Old Testament nationalistic form, it was a message of judgment. Before mighty Babylon would conquer Jerusalem, it was announced that Babylon would be superseded on the stage of history, and that by an inferior kingdom. For Daniel, his friends, and all the saints who had and would feel the power of mighty Babylon in a most per-

sonal way, it was a message of comfort and hope, for mighty Babylon would pass off the scene, as would its three successors. When the fourth kingdom appeared on the stage of history, the Stone cut without hands would strike the Great Colossus and destroy it completely. The Stone would grow and become a Great Mountain filling the earth. The Kingdom of God, destroyed in its outward form by Nebuchadnezzar, would dramatically reappear with the coming of the fourth kingdom. Judgment would fall on the kingdoms of this world; the Kingdom would fill the earth. Prophecy both reveals and conceals. Dispensationalists and premillennialists point out that there was no clash between Caesar and Christ at the first coming; so they look for fulfillment at the second coming of Christ to establish His alleged millennial kingdom. But the dream and its interpretation assure us that the Stone struck the Great Colossus and completely destroyed it at the time of the fourth or Roman Empire. That judgment occurred on Golgotha when Satan also in his role as prince of this world was judged (Luke 10:18; John 12:31; 14:30). It was confirmed by the King's triumphant descent into hell. That judgment is a matter of faith; it will become a matter of sight at the consummation. The Stone becoming the Mountain is assured by the resurrection; that also is a matter of faith. It too will become a matter of sight at the consummation.

Daniel could only ponder the glory of it from his historical perspective, but a nagging question must have haunted him: What of his people? He knew from the prophecies of Jeremiah and others that Jerusalem would be destroyed and the nation transported to Babylon. In the unfolding of the history of the four kingdoms and the establishing of the Kingdom during the fourth kingdom, as portrayed by Nebuchadnezzar's dream, no mention was made of Daniel's people. What hopes, mingled with fears, must have passed through his mind as he discussed the significance of it all with his friends.

Chapter 7: The Vision of the Four Beasts. Chapter 7 is the first chapter of the second part of the book, the prophetic section (7-12), but also the last chapter of the Aramaic section (2-7).

Daniel's dream parallels Nebuchadnezzar's dream with these differences: 1) Nebuchadnezzar's dream emphasized the monolithic nature of the anti-Kingdom of God kingdoms of this world from their human side (the human form of the Great Colossus); Daniel's vision portrayed the diversity of those kingdoms with emphasis on their bestial nature. 2) Nebuchadnezzar's dream revealed four successive world kingdoms; Daniel's vision revealed two further developments, the ten horns (kings or kingdoms, v. 24) which shall develop from the fourth kingdom and the "little horn." 3) In Nebuchadnezzar's dream judgment upon the monolithic kingdoms of this world occurred when the Stone struck the Great Colossus and reduced it to chaff; in Daniel's vision a court scene is depicted with judgment in progress. The body of the fourth beast with the "little horn" is seen as destroyed and given to the burning flame (v. 11). In both Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Daniel's vision the Messianic or New Testament era is telescoped, judgment falling during the time of the fourth kingdom (the cross-resurrection event) with the final working out of judgment/salvation at the consummation. 4) In Nebuchadnezzar's dream the Kingdom of God appears in the impersonal form of the Stone which becomes the Mountain; in Daniel's vision One like the Son of Man appeared before the Ancient of Days to receive the Kingdom (the coronation of Jesus at His ascension--"All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth"--as symbolized in the throne scene and the Lamb taking the scroll in Rev. 4-5). 5) The depressing features of Daniel's vision were the appearance of the "little horn" (the Roman Antichrist) and the persecution of the saints.

The above is additional comment on the exegesis of the chapter. In the introduction to this Vision of the Four Beasts the writer states that God gave Daniel this vision to show him "what the future held for his people" (130). But again no specific mention is made of Daniel's people as the four kingdoms succeed each other (which turned out to be five centuries). Daniel was grieved in spirit (v. 15) and asked for additional interpretation. He learned that in the distant future "the saints of the Most High shall receive the Kingdom

and possess the Kingdom forever, even forever and ever" (v. 18). but also that "the same horn was making war against the saints, and prevailing against them" (v. 21) until judgment was made in favor of the saints (v. 22). This information greatly troubled Daniel and caused his countenance to be changed (v. 28). Daniel was conditioned to think of the Kingdom in terms of the nation of Israel. The immediate future with regard to the nation was a blank and the distant future appeared to be bleak for his people, but ultimate victory brought a ray of hope and joy.

The writer considers the Vision of the Ancient of Days (vv. 9-10) to be a picture of the last judgment (138). The heavenly court, however, is in continual session. For example, "the books were opened" on the Babylonian Empire when the handwriting appeared on the wall of Belshazzar's banquet hall (5:25-29). The fourth beast was slain (v. 11). Judgment was pronounced on Calvary, the execution to be carried out in history with finality at the consummation. Again the New Testament era is telescoped.

Chapter 8: The Vision of a Ram and a Goat. The writer asserts: "Daniel chapter 8 describes two frightening eras that were in store for God's people. The first was a period of extreme suffering in the more immediate future. The second was a period of deception and danger in the more distant future" (149). This projection, namely, of a second distant future period of deception and danger, is enlarged upon on pp. 159 and 160. What induces the discussion of a later New Testament period of deception and danger? It is the time term that Gabriel used when he said to Daniel: "'Son of man,' he said to me, 'understand that the vision concerns the time of the end'" (v. 17). The writer apparently assumes that "the time of the end" designates what is called "the end-time" of the present New Testament era.

The writer correctly states, "As was the case in Daniel 7, the second half of this chapter is an interpretation of the first half" (158). Agreed! The first

half brought the vision of a ram (Medo-Persia) and its conquest by a goat (Alexander). It also showed the fourfold division of the Greek Kingdom after the death of Alexander with the "little horn" sprouting from one of those horns. The writer correctly identifies this "little horn" as Antiochus Epiphanes. Verses 15-27, as the writer informs us, brings the interpretation of the first part. Gabriel told Daniel that the vision concerns "the time of the end" (v. 17, לְעֵת־קֵץ). The time of what end? Gabriel was explaining "especially the "little horn," which developed historically at the time of the end of the Greek Empire in its Seleucid form (175-164 BC), which corresponded with the end of the second phase of the history of Israel. Gabriel continued by saying, "I am going to tell you what will happen later in the time of wrath, because the vision concerns the appointed time of the end" (v. 19, בְּאַחֲרִית הַזֶּעַם כִּי לְמוֹעֵד קָץ). Then Gabriel explained that the ram with the two horns was Media and Persia and the goat was Greece. He mentioned the four kingdoms that would arise after Alexander. He then elaborated on developments that would occur "in the latter time of their kingdom" (v. 23, בְּאַחֲרִית מַלְכוּתָם). Thus the time terms limit the *terminus ad quem* of the vision to the "latter time" of the Greek Kingdom after it had been divided, specifically the time of Antiochus Epiphanes which was also the latter time of Daniel's people. Verses 23-25 are Gabriel's interpretation of verses 9-14. Thus the vision is limited to the Old Testament secular anti-christ. Recall that chapter 8 begins the second section, written in Hebrew, that deals with Daniel's people. Daniel fainted and was sick for days (v. 27) because of what was in store for his people. In the dream of Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 2 and Daniel's visions in chapter 7 Daniel's people were not mentioned, for that section dealt with successive kingdoms of this world and their relation to the future manifestation of the Kingdom of God, which would not appear until the fourth empire appeared on the stage of history. Beginning with chapter 8, however, the focus is on the vicissitudes of Daniel's people, the nation of Israel or the Kingdom in its Old Testament nationalistic form.

Chapter 9: Daniel's Prayer and the Seventy-Sevens Prophecy. In this chapter Daniel appears as patriot interceding for his people with the plea that the Lord, the God of covenant, remember His covenant. The writer refers to Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 (171) but fails to point out the covenantal structure of Daniel's prayer to which Gabriel brought the Lord's response. For this aspect of Daniel's prayer see "The Covenant of the Seventieth Week" by Meredith G. Kline in *The Law and the Prophets*, edited by John H. Skilton, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.

The response to Daniel's prayer to the Lord God to keep His covenant came in the form of Gabriel's seventy-sevens prophecy. Verse 24 assured Daniel that within seventy sevens the covenant, originally made with Abraham and repeatedly confirmed to Israel, that promised blessing to all nations would be fulfilled. The writer correctly interpreted the six phrases evangelically as fulfilled in Christ. For a fuller exegesis of the six phrases see the undersigned's article, "Discerning the Spiritual," in the *Journal of Theology*, December 1984, pp. 17-26.

The three divisions of the seventy sevens are seven, sixty-two, and one. The first period of seven "sevens" represents "the period during which Jerusalem's temple and its city walls were rebuilt at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah" (178). Agreed. The sixty-two "sevens" represent "the period from Jerusalem's rebuilding to Messiah's coming and death" (178). Page 181 adds that "at the end of the sixty-two 'sevens' two important events will occur"--the cutting off of the Messiah and the destruction of Jerusalem. These two events, however, occur after the sixty-two "sevens," as verse 26 clearly states. Verse 25 makes the *terminus a quo* of the first seven "sevens" "the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem." The *terminus ad quem* of the sixty-two "sevens" is "until the Anointed One, the ruler, comes" (v. 25). Then "after the sixty-two 'sevens,' the Anointed One will be cut off" and Jerusalem destroyed (v. 26). Verse 27 embellishes and reinforces. It embellishes by adding the confirming of the

covenant and the bringing to an end of sacrifice and offering; it reaffirms the destruction of Jerusalem.

The confirming of the covenant and the putting an end to sacrifice and offering are consequences of the cutting off of the Messiah. The "he" who confirms the covenant is the Messiah, not some end-time antichrist, as the dispensationalists allege. The Hebrew form of the verb for confirm (הִגִּיֵּר, hiphil) in itself undermines and demolishes the dispensational misinterpretation of this passage. They introduce an end-time antichrist as making a covenant with the Jews. The standard technical term for making a covenant is "cutting a covenant" (כָּרַת בְּרִית). The hiphil form of the verb used here means confirming an existing covenant. The entire book of Hebrews is the Spirit's own exegesis of putting an end to sacrifice and offering. The dispensationalists imagine a restoration of the temple and its services, followed by the breaking of that covenant with the Jews by the antichrist.

The cutting off of the Anointed One, together with the confirming of the covenant and the putting an end to sacrifice and offering would seemingly all occur in the middle of the seventieth "seven." But what of the destruction of the city and sanctuary? Gabriel just said that it would come "after the sixty-two 'sevens.'" The undersigned believes that the "ruler who will come" is the "Anointed One," since the entire prophecy revolves about the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant. His people, who shall serve as agents of His judgment, are the Roman armies under Titus.

Think of the impact of this prophecy upon Daniel and all the faithful among the captives in Babylon. On the one hand, they received the assurance that the Lord would, indeed, keep His covenant, solving the problem of sin once and for all time, thereby bringing the blessing promised to Abraham to all families of the earth. On the other hand, Daniel learned that Jerusalem and the temple, then lying in ruins, would surely be rebuilt and restored, only to be destroyed again. The desolations were decreed!

Chapters 10-12: The Fourth Vision. Chapter 10 brings the introduction to Daniel's final vision. The time frame of that vision is set in verse 14: "Now I have come to explain to you what will happen to your people *in the future*, for the vision concerns a time yet to come." "In the future" is the translation for **בְּאַחֲרֵי יָמִים**, which Daniel had used in 2:28 when he told Nebuchadnezzar that the God in heaven was showing him "what will happen in days to come." The writer interprets the term as follows: "When the Old Testament prophets use the expression here translated 'the future,' the term always includes not only the immediate future but the distant future, reaching out even to the time of the Messiah and beyond" (192). On the basis of this interpretation of the time term the writer sets the scope of Daniel's final vision as follows: "The vision God gave Daniel 'concerned a great war.' God showed Daniel that a time of intense hardship would come upon the Jewish people in the centuries just ahead. And this conflict would grow even more intense in the difficult days preceding the end of the world" (185). Wittingly or unwittingly the writer has adopted the "leap frog" technique of the futurists with their "end-time" fictional eschatology.

As noted in the discussion of chapter 2, **בְּאַחֲרֵי יָמִים** is a covenantal Kingdom time term. Beginning at the historical situation of the writer it refers to the covenantal unfolding of the Kingdom. The vision deals with Daniel's people, the nation of Israel, and their future as God's Kingdom people. The *terminus a quo* was the beginning of the second world kingdom, the Medo-Persian Empire. The *terminus ad quem* reached into the Messianic era coming to a close with the termination of the nation of Israel as the Lord's special Kingdom people, namely, with the second destruction of Jerusalem, the temple, and the nation by the Romans in 70 AD. The time framework of the vision does not exceed that limit, as the prophecy itself makes clear and the interpretation of the man in linen confirms.

The time term that is peculiar to this vision is **עַתָּה**, which is translated "the time of the end." That time term occurs in 8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9. The

question is the time of the end of which period--the Kingdom in its Old Testament form or the Kingdom in its New Testament church form? The writer opts for the latter and finds a break between verses 35 and 36, which introduces "the king." He writes, "The closing ten verses of chapter 11 no longer point to Antiochus Epiphanes [correct], but are an Old Testament prediction of God's archenemy, of whom Antiochus was a type. St. Paul gives us the key to the correct interpretation of this passage in 2 Thessalonians 2:4, where he gives us a description of the Antichrist which is remarkably similar to Daniel's: 'He opposes and exalts himself over everything that is called God or is worshiped'" (212). The undersigned disagrees with this interpretation. The vision had been tracing the vicissitudes of the Jews, as they were caught up in the struggles between the Seleucids and Ptolomies, with special emphasis upon Antiochus Epiphanes and the following Maccabean period. The prophetic narrative continues without a break, each sentence being connected with the following by "and" (וְ). There is no break or eschatological leap into the New Testament "end-time." The Maccabean period of the history of Daniel's people is followed by the Roman period. "The king" in verse 36 and on to the end of the vision is King Herod and his house. This reviewer first came upon that interpretation more than a quarter of a century ago in Philip Mauro's *The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation* (135ff.). This interpretation is usually ignored or simply dismissed by other interpreters because of traditional exegetical ruts or dogmatic bias. A reading of Josephus and the secular history of the intertestamental period gives credence to this interpretation, as the undersigned hopes to demonstrate in future articles. This interpretation also eliminates the exegetical foot-peddling in verses 40-45.

The clincher for this interpretation comes in the answer of "the man clothed in linen" to one of the men standing on the river bank, "How long will it be before these astonishing things are fulfilled?" "The man clothed in linen" answered, "When the power of the holy people has been finally broken, all these things will be completed" (v. 6-7). The vision dealt with the future

of Daniel's people; "the holy people" are, therefore, Daniel's people, the nation of Israel. Their power was broken with the second destruction of Jerusalem, their temple, and nation by the Romans in 70 AD.

The traditional interpretation of 12:2 as referring to the physical resurrection of the dead also needs reexamination. But more of this at a later date.

Paul F. Nolting

Family Devotion Hour, by C. M. Gullerud. 197 pages, paperback, \$5.50.

This book consists of 100 devotions designed for use by Christian families. The texts are drawn from many parts of Holy Scripture, and a wide range of Christian doctrines are covered. All of the devotions are thoroughly evangelical, in that Jesus Christ appears in all His saving glory, and the power of the Holy Spirit in this Gospel is the means for producing both faith and fruits of faith. More than that, the devotions are timely, in that they touch on many of the issues that are of special concern to Christian parents and children in our day.

That this book has been well received is evident from the fact that it is already going into a second printing. It can be ordered from the CLC Book House, Immanuel Lutheran College, 501 Grover Rd., Eau Claire, WI 54701, or from the author, who lives at 218 Grover Rd., Eau Claire.

C. Kuehne



JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY
CHURCH OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSION
IMMANUEL LUTHERAN COLLEGE

West Grover Road
EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN 54701



Forwarding Postage Guaranteed
Address Correction Requested

Postmaster: Send notice on Form 3579
to: *Journal of Theology*, 2750 Oxford
Street N., Roseville, MN 55113.

U. S. POSTAGE
Permit No. 34

PAID

EAU CLAIRE, WIS.
Non-Profit
Organization

J 248 DEC 85
STEVE SWANSON
25 UNIVERSITY CT
MANKATO MN 56001